

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 11-13 to further clarify the unique features claimed therein.

**I. Summary of the Office Action**

The Examiner withdrew the previous grounds of rejection. The Examiner, however, now rejects claims 1-9 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-13<sup>1</sup> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriyama et al. (US 5,710,634), hereinafter referred to as “Kuriyama”, in combination with Barry et al. (US 5,859,711), hereinafter referred to as “Barry” in view of Vives (US 6,663,304 B2), hereinafter referred to as “Vives”. Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following comments.

Of these rejected claims, claims 1 and 11-13 are independent. These independent claims *inter alia* and in some variation recite: both the first print head and the second print head being equipped on the carriage and a clutch disposed between the first medium supply section and the second medium supply section, where if the clutch is disengaged, the first medium supply section and the second medium supply section supply the recording medium independently and if the clutch is engaged, the first medium supply section and the second medium supply section cooperate to supply the recording medium.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that the Examiner indicated that only claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) but based on page 9 of the Office Action, it appears that claim 12 is also rejected.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kuriyama in view of Barry do not disclose or suggest the carriage and the print heads being disposed on this carriage (*see* page 4 of the Office Action). The Examiner, however, alleges that Vives cures this deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Vives discloses a printer 400 which may use a carriage support or track 402 to carry printing units 404 or cartridges. The printing unit 404 or units run on the carriage track 402, which surrounds the print medium front 406 and back 418 print surfaces. The continuous carriage track 402 runs parallel to the print medium front 406 and back 418 print surfaces. Vives further discloses at least two printing units such as 206, 208, and optionally units 210, 212 (shown in dashed lines) being disposed on an oblong belt 214 which may be driven on a set of two pulleys 216, 224 arranged around the printing media 236, so that the printing units 206, 208, 210, 212 travel on a track 218A, 218B in the direction of pulley movement while printing first information on the one surface 242 of the print medium and second information on the opposing surface 244 of the print medium (Figs. 2 and 4; col. 3, lines 15 to 33 and col. 6, lines 15 to 24).

In Vives, however, the printing units 206, 208, 210, and 212 travel independently (Fig. 5; col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 10). That is, in Vives, the print heads included in these printing units are equipped on different carriages. In other words, Vives does not disclose or suggest two print heads being equipped on the same carriage.

Furthermore, Kuriyama, Barry, and Vives do not disclose or suggest the clutch as set forth in the independent claims 1 and 11-13.

For at least these exemplary reasons, claims 1 and 11-13 are patentable over Kuriyama in view of Barry and Vives. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 1 and 11-13 and dependent claims 2-7, and 9.

Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriyama, Barry, Vives, and further in view of Botten et al. (US 2003/0098984 A1), hereinafter referred to as "Botten". Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following comments.

Claim 8 depends on claim 1. It was already demonstrated that Kuriyama, Barry, and Vives do not meet all the requirements of independent claims 1. Botten is relied upon only for its alleged disclosure of the drive force blocking section (*see* page 10 of the Office Action). Clearly, Botten does not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Kuriyama, Barry, and Vives. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claim 1. Since claim 8 depend on claim 1, it is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

### III. Conclusion

Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

Date: October 9, 2009